A Near-Atheist as a Juror.—Is a juror disqualified who, though he believes in a supreme power, does not believe in future rewards or punishments, has no personal fear of future punishment, and does not believe in either the Old or the New Testaments? Such a juror was challenged for cause in State *v.* Jackson, 137 Northwestern Reporter, 1034, the challenge overruled, and after all peremptory challenges were exhausted counsel moved for the discharge of this juror for the reason that he could not take an oath that would be binding upon his conscience. This motion was overruled, and the juror without objection took the orthodox oath with the other jurors. This ruling is assigned as error. The Supreme Court of Iowa holds that the rulings were correct, for the juror possessed all the statutory qualifications, and was not subject to challenge for the reasons assigned. The court says: "He took the oath without objection, thus evidencing the fact that he regarded it as binding upon his conscience. Under modern rules oaths are to be administered to all persons according to their own opinions, and as it most affects their consciences. * * * Under our law any person otherwise competent may take an oath and act as a juror no matter what his religious belief is, provided, of course, that such oath is in a form which the person who takes it regards as binding upon his conscience."

MISCELLANY.

Rehearings.—In the following cases petitions for rehearings are pending: Virginia Beach Development Co. *v.* Murray, 75 S. E. 81; Collins *v.* Board of Trustees of Davis & Elkins College, Dec. 3, 1912.

Women as Lawyers.—In both branches of the profession the question of the admission of women is being raised. A motion in favour of women being allowed to become solicitors was discussed at the Cardiff meeting of the Law Society, and, although it was not carried, the Council have since expressed their willingness, at the instance of a young lady who is desirous of being admitted to the Roll, to become a party to any properly framed proceedings she may take for the purpose of having the question of her eligibility determined by the Courts. For the annual meeting of the Bar, Mr. Holford Knight has given notice of the following motion: "That this meeting approves of the admission of women to membership of the Bar." This is, indeed, a question in which both branches of the profession are equally interested, for it is impossible to believe that women will ever be admitted to one branch and excluded from the other. Even if women were admitted as solicitors only, the sphere of advocacy

would still be open to them, for they would acquire a right of audience in the County Courts, where the work increases in volume and importance. For our part, we hope that neither the Inns nor Chancery Lane will fall to this feminine attack. There are certain classes of cases which no man could conduct with freedom if his opponent belonged to the other sex, and these, perhaps, are precisely the special cases in which women might be most frequently employed. Judges and juries, as well as advocates, would find themselves hampered by the appearance of women as advocates in such cases, and the interests of justice would inevitably suffer by reason of this feeling of restraint. The question, then, of the admission of women to the legal profession may be determined quite apart from the larger question of woman suffrage. Nor need existing professional interests be considered. The vital point is whether the admission of women as lawyers would interfere with the administration of the law, and nobody possessing a real acquaintance with the work of the Courts can doubt that it would.—London Law Journal, Jan. 18, 1913.

IN VACATION.

Dissolution of Partnership.—A West Virginia darky, a blacksmith, recently announced a change in his business as follows: "Notice—De co-pardnership heretofore resisting between me and Mose Skinner is hereby resolved. Dem what owe de firm will settle wid me, and dem what de firm owes will settle wid Mose."—National Corporation Reporter.

Fined at Excursion Rates.—Magistrate's court in a mountain county of eastern Kentucky, held at a county schoolhouse. Prisoner, Jno. Foreman, charged with hitting T. J. Purdee with a whip stock. After all evidence was in, the court wrote the instructions for the jury of six, as follows:

Commonwealth vs. Jon. furmen. Salt & batter.

1. ef tha Jury bleeve from tha evdence that Jon furmen is gilty of strikin t. J. purdee with tha butt eend of a whoop stock er eny uther blunt insterment, malishus & malonus er with malis forethink, you shood find him exceedin won hundred dollars at your excursion.

2. ef you bleeve that he used eny salt and batter on him you shood also find him exceedin won hundred dollars and cost at your excursion.

"Gentlemen, now the jury will tire to the bushes and fine a verdick."

The spokesman of the jury, on retiring back of the schoolhouse,